

E 4756

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

August 31, 1976

This proposal parallels language that already exists in the constitution of my home State of Ohio. In fact, State legislatures in about 20 other States also are bound by similar constitutional or statutory provisions.

My purpose now is not to promote my legislation for any action tomorrow. Several of us tried to push it on various occasions in the past year, but the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has refused to schedule a hearing on it.

Rather, my purpose today is to remind my colleagues, and the public, that we have not yet taken any positive action to dig ourselves out of the hole we created last summer.

I do not care if we accept my specific proposal or one of the other, similar ideas that have been put forward. But I do want to note that sooner or later the Congress must adopt a rational policy regarding our pay raises, so that we do not again have to resort to "playing games" with amendments to appropriations bills, as we will tomorrow, in order to correct our legislative folly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I will vote in favor of the expected amendment to prohibit an automatic cost-of-living pay raise for Members of Congress during fiscal year 1977, but I will do so with regret.

LOOKING BACK AT VIETNAM

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, if our foreign policy is to promote America's goals over the next decade, it is essential that we learn from our successes and mistakes of the past decade.

Certainly as time develops between the present and America's involvement in the Vietnam war, I believe it is essential that we continue to look back and judge what we did right and wrong in that conflict.

Toward that end, I would like to submit for the Record the following editorial from the August 9 edition of the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat:

ANOTHER LOOK AT VIETNAM WAR

When the United States was up to its ears in the horribleness of the Vietnam War, many Americans were wont to believe only those pronouncements coming from Hanoi—pronouncements generally to the effect that we were intruding on a domestic squabble, albeit a military one.

Therefore, maybe—just maybe—those same people will now listen to the words of one Gen. Van Tien Dung, North Vietnam's chief of staff. The Wall Street Journal, editorializing on the general's memoirs, noted some highly significant phrases; and those phrases decidedly put to rest the fantasy that the Vietnam War was a civil war—whether the doubters like it or not. And The Journal wraps up its opinion like this:

"The Vietnam War is better put behind us, since there were more than enough mistakes and errors in judgment to go around. But before the revisionist theory of how and why the U.S. got involved becomes official doctrine, from which we may never digest it's worth mentioning that official Wash-

ton was right about one thing, at least: the Vietnam War was a war between two separate states, one of which invaded the other. And the recent unification (of North and South Vietnam) is not a sign that Saigon—pardon us, Ho Chi Minh City—is eager to become an appendage of the north. It is only a sign that aggression, like crime, sometimes pays."

The Journal, quoting from a New York Times account of the general's memoirs, notes:

"Apparently because the Communists have now essentially achieved reunification of the North and the South, Gen. Dung makes no effort to preserve earlier Communist claims that there was a separate movement in the South, which they called the National Liberation Front and the Americans termed the Viet Cong. On the contrary, Gen. Dung, who is a member of the Politburo of the Lao Dong or Workers' party, provides a vivid description of how the Politburo and the Central Military party committee, operating from what he calls 'Dragon House' in Hanoi, directed the war."

Okay. There it is. The United States did not stick its military nose into private and civil war. This nation answered a legitimate call for help from another nation, revisionist nonsense to the contrary.

CALL FOR RESIGNATION OF JOHN CONNALLY FROM THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I am inserting in the Record a letter I sent to President Ford urging the removal of John Connally from the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. The text follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1976.THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write to urge that you request the immediate resignation of John Connally from the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. The conflict between Mr. Connally's public role as a member of the Board and his private role as chairman of the Citizens Alliance for Mediterranean Freedom—in which he openly advocates interference or, as he terms it, "meddling," in the internal affairs of foreign governments—can only be reconciled by his resignation.

In February you affirmed your commitment to a "comprehensive program" of reform of the intelligence agencies to halt documented past abuses. As part of the broader effort at reform, you expanded the membership of the Board and reappointed John Connally to it. Yet any promise of reform your action may have inspired is severely compromised by Mr. Connally's continued presence on the Board. To permit an individual who actively and professionally endorses the concept of U.S. intervention abroad to review our intelligence efforts represents a major step backwards in the concept of effective oversight.

For the Board to provide "independent, nonpartisan advice on the effectiveness of our foreign intelligence efforts," as you stressed on March 11, the members themselves must be impartial, dispassionate and objective individuals. In this regard, a portion of his private life to heading an orga-

nization whose express purpose is overt interference in the internal affairs of foreign governments can hardly be said to possess the degree of impartiality necessary to review covert interference in the affairs of these same governments by the intelligence agencies. The intelligence agencies themselves are capable and zealous advocates of their plans and programs. If the overseers and analysts are equally zealous advocates, then the oversight and review process becomes irretrievably impaired.

In a June 8 New York Times ad, John Connally announced the formation of the Citizens Alliance for Mediterranean Freedom, an activist organization that would concern itself with the "deteriorating situation in Southern Europe, the Middle East and Northern Africa." As its first order of business, Mr. Connally stated, the organization would attempt to warn Italian citizens "not to become beguiled by the unfulfilled promises of communism." To this end, Mr. Connally continued, an effort would be made to recruit "millions" of Americans to carry out a "vigorous program of activity" which would include the establishment of "communications" between "concerned Americans and their counterparts in Mediterranean nations." When asked if such activities constituted "meddling" in the internal affairs of foreign countries, Mr. Connally conceded that such action "probably is meddling" (Houston Post, May 4).

The case of Italy provides a clear illustration of the incompatibility of Mr. Connally's public and private sector roles. Last December, in briefings of congressional committees, then CIA Director William Colby reported your approval of \$6 million in secret cash payments to individual anti-Communist political leaders in Italy "in an effort to prevent Communist gains" (New York Times, January 7). As a member of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, whose purpose is to review the objectives, conduct and management of the overall national intelligence effort (Executive Order 11460), Mr. Connally would be expected to make recommendations on our intelligence efforts in Italy. But as head of a private group that is actively engaged in furthering specific political objectives in Italy, it is inconceivable that Mr. Connally would be in a position to provide the Executive Office with a detached and balanced assessment of the scope and direction of our foreign intelligence efforts in that country.

While Mr. Connally's public and private positions may not directly violate any conflict of interest statutes, his simultaneous roles as advisor and advocate contravene the spirit of public policy directed at intelligence-community reform. Thus I find it clearly improper—indeed, alarming—that an individual charged with the serious responsibility of evaluation of intelligence activities should compromise this obligation by pursuing private ends through a course of action which in his own words constitutes "meddling" in the internal affairs of other countries. After a year of public debate over the need for intelligence community reform, Mr. Connally's continued presence on the Board only heightens the prevailing public skepticism about the seriousness of Executive efforts to strengthen the oversight and review process.

The history of abuses by our intelligence agencies can be directly traced to superficial or nonexistent oversight by Executive and Legislative authorities. In the interest of the reforms you affirmed earlier this year, I am taking this opportunity to urge in the strongest terms that you give this matter your immediate and most serious consideration. Clearly the only appropriate response is that you request Mr. Connally's immediate resignation from the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

Very sincerely,
MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Executive Registry

76-3399

FROM:

EXTENSION

NO.

Legislative Counsel

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

DATE

STATOTHR
7 September 1976

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

Attached herewith is a copy of a letter from Rep. Harrington to the President as it appeared in the August 31, 1976 Congressional Record, in which Harrington calls on the President to remove John Connally from the Foreign Intel 25X10 gence Advisory Board. In his letter, Harrington makes reference to CIA

25X1A

George L. Cary

OLC

1.	Deputy Director	DATE		RECEIVED	FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS
		RECEIVED	FORWARDED			
2.	Director					
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						